

# Chapter 4

## Coordination and Consultation

**Chapter 4** summarizes the coordination and consultation activities performed for this study among the federal, state, and local agencies and the public.

Throughout this study, the MaineDOT and the FHWA, acting as joint lead agencies, coordinated with federal and state regulatory and resource agencies, the tribes, BACTS (i.e., the MPO), the city and towns in the study area, the regional and other special-interest groups, and the public.

**Scoping.** There shall be an early and open process for determining the scope of issues to be addressed and for identifying the significant issues related to a proposed action. This process shall be termed “scoping” (40 CFR 1501.7).

A complete description of the public-involvement program, including meeting agendas, handouts, maps, presentations, displays, and minutes, is on the study website [www.i395-rt9-study.com](http://www.i395-rt9-study.com) on the “Stay Informed” page.

### 4.1 Scoping and Early Coordination

In support of the preparation of the EA, a public scoping and informational meeting was held on April 11, 2001. The purposes of the meeting were to (1) review the planning and programming activities that led to the initiation of the study, and (2) provide an opportunity for public comments at the beginning of the study. The meeting was preceded by an informal open house; the formal part of the meeting consisted of a presentation and discussion of the history, purpose and needs of the study, and a broad review of strategies and alternatives for satisfying the purpose and needs. About 60 people attended the meeting, most of which was spent in questions and answers about the time required to complete the study, methods for collecting traffic data and predicting traffic volumes, relationship of the study to the east–west highway initiative, use of rail to move people and goods, sources of funding, and subsequent phases, including construction. Suggestions from the public were to use rail to ease truck traffic and reduce speed limits to improve safety.

#### Chapter Contents

- 4.1 Scoping and Early Coordination
- 4.2 Federal and State Agency Interagency Coordination Meetings
- 4.3 Public Involvement

## **4 • I-395/Route 9 Transportation Study Environmental Impact Statement**

The MaineDOT and the FHWA conducted scoping with the federal and state regulatory and resource agencies using the MaineDOT monthly interagency coordination meetings. Scoping was initiated in late 2000 and concluded in early 2001.

In December 2000, scoping and early-coordination letters were mailed to federal and state regulatory and resource agencies, the city and towns in the study area, and regional and special-interest groups, in accordance with the procedural provisions of the NEPA and requirements and policies of the MaineDOT and the FHWA. Letters accompanied by a map of the study area, a description of the study purpose and the need for action, and an outline of the study to be conducted were mailed to provide notification of the study, request specific information pertaining to the study area, and encourage participation by identifying areas of initial concern for consideration and inclusion in the study (exhibit 4.1). There were no key resources or issues of primary concern identified.

In October 2005, the FHWA elevated the I-395/Route 9 transportation study to an EIS because of potential impacts to wetlands and difficulty in identifying mitigation for those impacts. In response to the need to prepare an EIS, the FHWA published the NOI to prepare the EIS on December 1, 2005, in the *Federal Register* (*Federal Register*, Vol. 70, No. 230, pages 72144-72145).

Following the decision to prepare an EIS, a second agency scoping and field view of the study area was conducted on June 3, 2008. The agencies in attendance were the MaineDOT and the FHWA, acting as joint lead agencies, with the USACE, USEPA, and USFWS acting as cooperating agencies. The discussions included the activities conducted to date, key resources in the study area, methods for analysis of impacts to the key resources, opportunities and expectations for mitigation for impacts to waters of the United States, and specifics for conducting the study using an integrated EIS and Section 404 format. The key resources and issues of concern were potential impacts to wetlands, potential difficulty in identifying mitigation for those impacts, and wildlife habitat. Several “connectors” between the westernmost alternatives were suggested for development and analysis.

Following the decision to prepare an EIS, a second public scoping and informational meeting was held on June 4, 2008. The purposes of the meeting were to provide (1) an update to the study, the reasons that an EIS was being prepared, and the differences between an EA and an EIS; and (2) an opportunity for the public to comment and identify concerns to be addressed in the study. The meeting was preceded by an informal open house; the formal part of the meeting consisted of a presentation and discussion of the legislative framework guiding the study, the study’s purpose and why it

**Exhibit 4.1 – Summary of Scoping and Early Coordination Letters during Preparation of the EA**

| <i>Agency or Organization</i>   | <i>Information Requested</i>   | <i>Information Received</i>  |
|---|--|--|
| <b>Federal Agencies</b>   |  |  |
| U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  | General letter requesting comments   | No response received   |
| U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service  | Federally listed or proposed threatened or endangered species and known critical habitats                                      | Bald eagle is known to occur in the study area   |
| U.S. Department of Agriculture, Maine State Office  | General letter requesting comments   | No response received   |
| U. S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Penobscot County | General letter requesting comments   | No response received   |
| U. S. Department of the Interior, Office of Environmental Policy & Compliance             | General letter requesting comments   | No response received   |
| U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  | General letter requesting comments   | No response received   |
| National Marine Fisheries Service   | General letter requesting comments   | No response received   |
| <b>State Agencies</b>   |  |  |
| Maine Department of Inland Fisheries Wildlife   | State listed or proposed, threatened or endangered species, known critical habitats, and other sensitive features and concerns | Map of significant and essential wildlife habitats   |
| Maine Department of Environmental Protection, Air Quality                                 | Previous studies of air quality in the region  | No response received   |
| Maine Department of Environmental Protection, Land and Water Quality Control              | General letter requesting comments   | A permit from the MDEP would be required if the proposed solution alters protected natural resources |
| Maine Geologic Survey   | Location of groundwater wells and groundwater quality; wellhead-protection areas and intake-protection areas                   | List and map of known bedrock wells in the study area  |
| Maine Department of Conservation, Forest Service  | General letter requesting comments   | No response received   |
| Maine Department of Conservation, Bureau of State Parks and Lands                         | Identification of parks, recreation areas, or lands using funds from the LWCF  | No response received   |
| Maine State Planning Office   | General letter requesting comments   | No response received   |
| Maine Natural Areas Program   | State listed or proposed, threatened or endangered species, critical habitats, and other sensitive features and concerns       | Two rare plant species are known to exist in the study area: American shoregrass and water stargrass |
| State Floodplain Management Coordinator   | General letter requesting comments   | Executive Order 11988 applies; use the 100-year flood standard                                       |

## **4 • I-395/Route 9 Transportation Study Environmental Impact Statement**

**Exhibit 4.1** – *Summary of Scoping and Early Coordination Letters during Preparation of the EA (continued)*

| <b>Agency or Organization</b>  | <b>Information Requested</b>   | <b>Information Received</b>  |
|--|--|--|
| Maine Department of Economic and Community Development, Office of Business Development | General letter requesting comments   | No response received   |
| Maine Department of Conservation, Grants and Community Recreation                      | General letter requesting comments   | Three properties in the study area received funding from the LWCF                  |
| Maine Department of Agriculture, Soil and Water Conservation Commission                | General letter requesting comments   | No response received   |
| Maine Department of Marine Resources   | General letter requesting comments   | No response received   |
| Maine Drinking Water Program   | Groundwater wells, surface-water intakes, wellhead-protection areas, intake-protection areas | Maps of public water supplies in the study area                                    |
| <b>Local Agencies</b>  |  |  |
| City of Brewer   | General letter requesting comments   | Offer of assistance from the Director of Environmental and Public Works            |
| Town of Holden   | General letter requesting comments   | Requested that proposed solutions be consistent with the town's comprehensive plan |
| Town of Eddington  | General letter requesting comments   | No response received   |
| <b>Regional or Other</b>   |  |  |
| Eastern Maine Development Corporation  | General letter requesting comments   | No response received   |
| Maine Citizens for Increased Jobs and Safety   | General letter requesting comments   | Comments supporting the need for the study   |

is needed, the resources and features in the study area, the range of reasonable alternatives, opportunities to learn more about the study and participate in it, results achieved to date, and issues identification. About 30 people attended the meeting most of which was spent in questions and answers about the time required to complete the study, sources of funding for the study, and subsequent phases, including construction.

Following the decision to begin preparation of an EIS, in October 2008, the MaineDOT and the FHWA mailed scoping and early-coordination letters to federal and state regulatory and resource agencies, the city and towns in the study area, and regional and special-interest groups. The letters directed recipients to the study website ([www.i395-rt9-study.com](http://www.i395-rt9-study.com)) for additional information about the study to be conducted.

Several letters requested specific information to be used in the study (exhibit 4.2). There were no key resources or issues of primary concern identified.

**Exhibit 4.2 – Summary of Scoping and Early Coordination Letters during Preparation of the EIS**

| <i>Agency or Organization</i>   | <i>Information Requested</i>   | <i>Information Received</i> |
|---|--|-----------------------------|
| <b>Federal Agencies</b>   |  |                             |
| U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  | General letter requesting comments   | No response received        |
| U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service  | Federally listed or proposed threatened or endangered species or known critical habitats in the study area | No response received        |
| U. S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Penobscot County | General letter requesting comments   | No response received        |
| U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region I  | General letter requesting comments   | No response received        |
| U.S. Geological Survey  | General letter requesting comments   | No response received        |
| Federal Emergency Regulation Commission   | General letter requesting comments   | No response received        |
| Federal Railroad Administration   | General letter requesting comments   | No response received        |
| Federal Transit Administration  | General letter requesting comments   | No response received        |
| National Oceanographic Atmospheric Administration Fisheries                               | General letter requesting comments   | No response received        |
| National Marine Fisheries Service   | General letter requesting comments   | No response received        |
| <b>Tribes</b>   |  |                             |
| Penobscot Indian Nation   | General letter requesting comments   | No response received        |
| Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians  | General letter requesting comments   | No response received        |
| Aroostook Band of Micmacs   | General letter requesting comments   | No response received        |
| Passamaquoddy Tribe of Indians  | General letter requesting comments   | No response received        |
| Passamaquoddy Tribe Pleasant Point  | General letter requesting comments   | No response received        |

## **4 • I-395/Route 9 Transportation Study Environmental Impact Statement**

### **Exhibit 4.2 – Summary of Scoping and Early Coordination Letters during Preparation of the EIS (continued)**

| <i>Agency or Organization</i>   | <i>Information Requested</i>  | <i>Information Received</i>  |
|---|---|--|
| <b>State Agencies</b>   |   |  |
| Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife                                 | State listed or proposed threatened or endangered species, known critical habitats, or other sensitive features or concerns | Bald eagle nest locations and proposed rules protecting Atlantic salmon              |
| Maine Department of Environmental Protection, Air Quality                         | Previous studies of air quality in the region   | No response received   |
| Maine Department of Environmental Protection, Land and Water Quality Control      | General letter requesting comments  | No response received   |
| Maine Historic Preservation Commission  | General letter requesting comments  | No response received   |
| Maine Geologic Survey   | Location of groundwater wells and groundwater quality; wellhead-protection areas and intake-protection areas                | Location of groundwater wells wellhead-protection areas, and intake-protection areas |
| Maine Department of Conservation  | General letter requesting comments  | No response received   |
| Maine Department of Conservation, Forest Service                                  | General letter requesting comments  | No response received   |
| Maine Department of Conservation, Bureau of State Parks and Lands                 | Identification of parks, recreation areas, or lands purchased with funds from the LWCF                                      | No response received   |
| Maine Atlantic Salmon Commission  | General letter requesting comments  | No response received   |
| Maine Department of Conservation, Northern Region Bureau of State Parks and Lands | General letter requesting comments  | No response received   |
| Maine State Planning Office   | General letter requesting comments  | Maine floodplain management program floodplain issues                                |
| Maine Natural Areas Program   | State listed or proposed threatened or endangered species, critical habitats, or other sensitive features or concerns       | No response received   |

**Exhibit 4.2 – Summary of Scoping and Early Coordination Letters during Preparation of the EIS (continued)**

| <b>Agency or Organization</b>   | <b>Information Requested</b>   | <b>Information Received</b>          |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|
| State Floodplain Management Coordinator   | General letter requesting comments   | No response received                 |
| Maine Department of Economic and Community Development, Office of Community Development | General letter requesting comments   | No response received                 |
| Maine Department of Agriculture Soil and Water Conservation Commission                  | General letter requesting comments   | No response received                 |
| Maine Department of Marine Resources  | General letter requesting comments   | Species of diadromous fish           |
| Maine Drinking Water Program  | Groundwater wells, surface-water intakes, wellhead-protection areas, intake-protection areas | No response received                 |
| Maine Emergency Management Agency   | General letter requesting comments   | No response received                 |
| Maine Department of Conservation, Off-Road Vehicles Division                            | General letter requesting comments   | No response received                 |
| Maine Tree Committee  | General letter requesting comments   | No response received                 |
| <b>Local</b>  |  |                                      |
| City of Brewer  | General letter requesting comments   | No response received                 |
| Town of Holden  | General letter requesting comments   | No response received                 |
| Town of Eddington   | General letter requesting comments   | No response received                 |
| Town of Clifton   | General letter requesting comments   | No response received                 |
| BACTS   | General letter requesting comments   | No response received                 |
| <b>Regional or Other</b>  |  |                                      |
| Eastern Maine Development Corporation   | General letter requesting comments   | No response received                 |
| Boy Scouts of America   | General letter requesting comments   | No response received                 |
| East – West Highway Association   | General letter requesting comments   | No response received                 |
| Maine Motor Transport Association   | General letter requesting comments   | Letter stating support for the study |
| Maine Snowmobile Association  | General letter requesting comments   | No response received                 |

## **4.2 Federal and State Agency Interagency Coordination Meetings**

This study was presented to the federal and state regulatory and resource agencies that attended the MaineDOT monthly interagency coordination meetings on eight occasions during preparation of the EA (exhibit 4.3). The federal and state regulatory and resource agencies that regularly attend these meetings are the USACE, USEPA, USFWS, NMFS, MDEP, MDIFW, MHPC, MDMR, and MDOC. Other federal and state regulatory and resource agencies attend these meetings as needed.

This study was presented to the federal and state regulatory and resource agencies that attended the MaineDOT monthly interagency coordination meetings on three occasions during preparation of the EIS (exhibit 4.4). The major issues addressed were the potential impacts to wetlands, streams, vernal pools, unfragmented habitat, the potential mitigation for those impacts, and the development and refinement of the build alternatives to further avoid and minimize impacts to the natural and social environment features in the study area. The cooperating agencies concurred with the range of reasonable alternatives to be retained for detailed analysis in the EIS in January 2008 (Appendix C).

## **4.3 Public Involvement**

Public participation was initiated early in the study to incorporate public comments and concerns into the development and analysis of the study needs, purpose, range of reasonable alternatives, potential resultant environmental impacts, and development of conceptual mitigation measures. Public participation continued throughout the study. The public-involvement program included the scoping meetings, meetings of the PAC, two public meetings, a website, information posters, and newsletters.

### ***4.3.1 Public Advisory Committee***

At the beginning of the study, a PAC consisting of local officials, business owners, the MPO, and private citizens from Bangor, Holden, Brewer, Eddington, Clifton, Bucksport, and Calais was formed. The purpose of the PAC and its meetings was to provide a forum and support the overall public-involvement program. The PAC participated in the study by meeting periodically with the MaineDOT and the FHWA and providing guidance on local issues and concerns. The PAC meetings were working sessions open to the public and included time for questions and answers (exhibit 4.5). Seventeen PAC meetings were held during the preparation of the EA.

Following the decision to begin the preparation of the EIS, a new PAC was formed. This PAC consisted of



**Exhibit 4.3 – Summary of Interagency Coordination Meetings and Results during Preparation of the EA**

| <i>Interagency Meeting</i> | <i>Discussion and Results</i>   |
|----------------------------|---|
| <b>November 14, 2000</b>   | The study was introduced and an overview of activities was provided.  |
| <b>February 13, 2001</b>   | The needs for the study, its purpose, and the natural resource and social environmental features in the study area were presented. The agencies in attendance concurred with the information presented.   |
| <b>October 9, 2001</b>     | The alternatives-analysis information to date was presented. The agencies in attendance concurred with the range of reasonable alternatives considered and the preliminary screening of alternatives to date.<br><b>Attended by:</b> USACE, USEPA, USFWS, NMFS, MDEP, MDIFW, MASC, and MDMR   |
| <b>March 12, 2002</b>      | An update to the alternatives analysis was presented. The agencies in attendance concurred with the range of alternatives considered but stated that Alternative 2B was practicable. The agencies requested that additional impacts to people living along Route 9 be quantified.<br><b>Attended by:</b> USACE, USFWS, and MDEP   |
| <b>October 8, 2002</b>     | An update to the alternatives analysis and the direction of the study were presented. The agencies in attendance concurred with the range of alternatives considered and the direction of the study.<br><b>Attended by:</b> USACE, USFWS, NMFS, and MASC  |
| <b>March 11, 2003</b>      | The agencies in attendance concurred with dismissing Alternative 2C-2 due to its greater impacts to farmlands and farming operations than other alternatives.<br><b>Attended by:</b> USACE, USEPA, USFWS, MDEP, MDIFW, and MASC   |
| <b>May 13, 2003</b>        | The agencies in attendance concurred with dismissing the remaining build alternatives except Alternative 3EIK-2, pending review of the “Transportation Improvement Strategies and Alternatives Analysis Technical Memorandum and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Highway Methodology Phase I Submission”—a document that summarizes and presents results of the alternatives-analysis process.<br><b>Attended by:</b> USACE, USEPA, USFWS, MDEP, MDIFW, MASC, and MHPC |
| <b>November 14, 2003</b>   | A modification of Alternative 2B-1 was discussed. It was agreed by the agencies in attendance that this modification should be dismissed from further consideration.<br><b>Attended by:</b> USACE, USFWS, MDEP, and MDOC  |

many of the same individuals who had participated in the study to date and several others with knowledge of the area and potential issues and concerns (Appendix B). These PAC meetings were working sessions open to the public and included time for questions and answers (exhibit 4.6). Three PAC meetings were held during the preparation of the EIS.

#### 4.3.2 Public Informational Meetings

Two public meetings were held during the preparation of the EA. The first meeting was the public scoping and informational meeting held on April 11, 2001 (section 4.1).

The second public meeting was held on September 19, 2001. The purpose of the meeting was to provide an update on the progress of the study since the public scoping and informational meeting in April 2001.

## **4 • I-395/Route 9 Transportation Study Environmental Impact Statement**

### ***Exhibit 4.4 – Summary of Interagency Coordination Meetings and Results during Preparation of the EIS***

| <b>Interagency Meeting</b> | <b>Discussion and Results</b>   |
|----------------------------|---|
| <b>October 9, 2007</b>     | <p>An update to the study was provided. The update consisted of changes in land use in the study area since 2003 and the current range of reasonable alternatives being considered and analyzed for obtaining the USACE Phase I approval.</p> <p><b>Attended by:</b> USACE, USEPA, USFWS, FHWA, MDMR, MDEP, and MNAP</p>  |
| <b>December 9, 2008</b>    | <p>An update to the alternatives analysis was presented. The update consisted of results of the six “connectors” between the three westernmost alternatives. The agencies in attendance concurred in continuing to study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 5A2E3K to 2B-2 connector 1 and/or 5A2E3K to 2B-2 connector 2</li><li>• 5A2E3K to 2B-2 connector 1 to 2B-2 to 5A2E3K to 2B-2 connector 2 and/or</li><li>• 5A2E3K to 2B-2 via connector 1 to 2B-2 to 5A2E3K via connector 3</li></ul> <p>The first two Alternatives beginning with 5A were chosen and named 5A2E3K-1 and 5A2E3K-2, respectively. Alternative 5B2E3K was modified to avoid the Dirigo Drive Business Park and named Alternative 5B2E3K-1.</p> <p><b>Attended by:</b> USACE, USFWS, NMFS, FHWA, and MDIFW</p>   |
| <b>May 12, 2009</b>        | <p>An update to the alternatives analysis and the resultant impacts was presented. The agencies in attendance concurred with dismissing Alternatives 1 and 3A-3EIK-1 from further consideration. The agencies requested a new alternative to be considered: 2B-2 plus improvements to Route 9 to East Eddington with a section on new alignment to the north of the intersection of Routes 9 and 46. Two other changes to alternatives were requested: (1) for the alternatives that begin with 5A, develop a partial cloverleaf interchange with Route 1A; and (2) for Alternative 3EIK-2, move a portion of the alternative closer to Clark Hill Road.</p> <p><b>Attended by:</b> USACE, USEPA, USFWS, NMFS, FHWA, MDEP, and MDOC</p>   |
| <b>January 12, 2010</b>    | <p>The alternatives in the Family of 5s was presented and discussed. Alternative 2B-2 is proximate to the family of 5s and shares partial alignment with one of the 5s. In light of the EO on floodplains, the MaineDOT suggested that Alternative 5B2E3K-1 could be dismissed from further consideration because of its potential impacts to floodplains; according to the EPA, the potential impacts to floodplains are not a sufficient reason to dismiss an alternative from further consideration because lost flood storage area can be replaced. Alternative 5B2E3K-1 should be retained for further consideration because of part of its alignment is adjacent to a Bangor Hydro-Electric utility easement. The Bangor Hydro-electric utility easements are disturbed and the resources within them are of lesser value than those in undisturbed locations. The Bangor Hydro-Electric utility easements are used for recreation and portions of them beneath the electrical lines are periodically mowed.</p> <p><b>Attended by:</b></p> |
| <b>October 11, 2011</b>    | <p>An update to the design criteria and conceptual design of the build alternatives retained for further consideration and the alternatives analysis and the resultant impacts was presented. The agencies concurred with identifying Alternative 2B-2 as the Preferred Alternative for satisfying the study purpose and need and satisfying the USACE’s overall and basic project purpose with the least adverse impact to the environment. It was agreed that Route 9 has sufficient capacity and would operate at comparable speeds in the design year and no improvements to Route 9 would be considered reasonably foreseeable. The MaineDOT would update the list of opportunities for compensatory wetland mitigation and include it in the DEIS that is circulated for public review to allow an opportunity to comment on mitigation.</p> <p><b>Attended by:</b> USACE, USEPA, USFWS, NMFS, FHWA, MDMR, MDEP, MDIFW</p>  |
| <b>December 13, 2011</b>   | <p>The administrative DEIS/Section 404 permit application supporting information was distributed to the Federal Cooperating Agencies for review and comment. The Federal Cooperating Agencies present provided a synopsis of their review of the administrative DEIS/Section 404 permit application supporting information so far. The USACE and the USFWS reported that their review of the administrative DEIS/Section 404 permit application supporting information was almost complete and no major gaps in material were found. Moving forward, the joint lead agencies – the FHWA and MaineDOT – discussed circulating the DEIS/Section 404 permit application supporting information and holding a joint public hearing with the USACE.</p> <p><b>Attended by:</b> FHWA, USACE, USFWS, MDMR, MNAP</p>  |

**Exhibit 4.5 – Summary of PAC Meetings during Preparation of the EA**

| <b>PAC Meeting</b>        | <b>Discussion and Results</b>   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <b>September 11, 2000</b> | Introduced the study-team participants and reviewed the scope of studies to be conducted, NEPA process, role of the PAC, and scope of the public-involvement and agency-coordination programs.  |
| <b>October 2, 2000</b>    | Discussions consisted of the purpose and needs for the study and how they are used in decision making. Three needs were discussed: system linkage, traffic congestion, and safety.  |
| <b>November 15, 2000</b>  | Discussions consisted of the study needs, goals, and objectives; study-area boundary; and important natural and social features in the study area.  |
| <b>January 17, 2001</b>   | Discussions consisted of the study needs, development of the study purpose and needs statement, and further identification of natural and social features.  |
| <b>February 28, 2001</b>  | Results of the interagency coordination, crash data, and traffic forecasts were discussed. Performance measures for developing alternatives were developed.   |
| <b>May 2, 2001</b>        | Results of the informational and scoping meeting held in April 2001 were discussed. Other items discussed were travel-demand forecasting, natural and social features, and preliminary alternatives identification and development. To develop alternatives, the study team, with the PAC, created 1,000-foot-wide corridors for alternatives that satisfy the needs and purpose of the study with the least adverse environmental impacts. The corridors were drawn on the mapping of features and were subsequently refined and developed into 46 alternatives. |
| <b>June 27, 2001</b>      | The range of reasonable alternatives, their overall feasibility, and preliminary impacts were presented. Results of the preliminary alternatives screening were explained. Changes were suggested to avoid and minimize impacts. Four additional alternatives were suggested.   |
| <b>July 18, 2001</b>      | The preliminary impacts for the additional alternatives developed were presented. A summary of traffic forecasting and analysis was presented.  |
| <b>October 23, 2001</b>   | Discussions consisted of results of the public and interagency coordination meetings in September and October 2001, a summary of regional transportation improvements and connected actions, traffic forecasting and analysis of alternatives, and a summary of the MaineDOT right-of-way and appraisal process. Alternative 1-4B was suggested for development and analysis.   |
| <b>December 19, 2001</b>  | Discussions consisted of impacts of Alternative 1-4B, range of alternatives, decision-making framework, and a summary of traffic forecasting and LOS analysis for the alternatives. The rationale for dismissing Alternatives 3E-2C and 3E-2C-2E was also discussed.  |
| <b>February 20, 2002</b>  | Comprehensive plans for the Bangor area, the city of Brewer, and the towns of Holden and Eddington were reviewed. Alternatives were discussed and identified for dismissal from further consideration.  |

## **4 • I-395/Route 9 Transportation Study Environmental Impact Statement**

### **Exhibit 4.5 – Summary of PAC Meetings during Preparation of the EA (continued)**

| <b>PAC Meeting</b>        | <b>Discussion and Results</b>  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>May 22, 2002</b>       | Discussions consisted of results of the interagency coordination meeting in March 2002, the range of reasonable alternatives retained for continued study, and conceptual interchange and intersection designs. Nine new alternatives were developed.  |
| <b>July 24, 2002</b>      | Discussions consisted of a resolution from Holden, the alternatives retained for continued study, the reasons for dismissing alternatives, and the traffic operational characteristics of the alternatives. Eight new alternatives were suggested.   |
| <b>September 18, 2002</b> | Discussions consisted of review of the alternatives retained for continued study and their potential impacts.  |
| <b>November 20, 2002</b>  | Discussions consisted of the range of reasonable alternatives, results of the interagency coordination meeting in October 2002, a summary of the MaineDOT right-of-way acquisition and relocation assistance programs, a summary of traffic forecasting, measures of effectiveness, and the rationale for dismissing a number of alternatives from further consideration. The town of Holden presented the results of its town meetings and an alternative that parallels existing utility corridors. Following this meeting, three alternatives – 2C-1, 2C-2, and 2C-1/2B-1 – were developed. |
| <b>January 15, 2003</b>   | Discussions consisted of the results of two town of Holden and a town of Eddington sponsored meetings and specific facets of Alternatives 2C-1, 2C-2, and 2C-1/2B-1. Alternatives 2C-2 and 3A-3EIK-1 were dismissed from further consideration. Alternative 4B and suggestions for improving it were reviewed.   |
| <b>April 30, 2003</b>     | Discussions consisted of dismissing Alternatives 2B-1 and 3A-3EIK-1 from further consideration, modifications to Alternative 3EIK-2 to further reduce impacts, the results of the March 11, 2003, interagency meeting and the March 28, 2003, meeting with the USACE and the USEPA, and retaining the No-Build Alternative, Alternative 3EIK-2, and, potentially, Alternative 2C-1/2B-1 for further consideration.   |

### **Exhibit 4.6 – Summary of PAC Meetings during Preparation of the EIS**

| <b>PAC Meeting</b>       | <b>Discussion and Results</b>  |
|--------------------------|--|
| <b>August 20, 2008</b>   | Introduced the study-team participants and reviewed the process for preparing an EIS and how the study would be performed, an overview of the PAC and its function and ground rules, results of the public and agency scoping meetings, the public-involvement and agency-coordination programs, and the schedule for the study moving forward.  |
| <b>November 19, 2008</b> | The PAC process and meeting ground rules were reviewed, followed by a review and discussion of the town of Holden's October 2008 resolution, traffic data, conceptual design of the range of reasonable alternatives including the "connectors," ways to further avoid and minimize impacts, and short-term activities to be performed.  |
| <b>April 15, 2009</b>    | An update to the alternatives analysis, the resultant impacts, and next steps were presented. The PAC was informed that Alternatives 5B2E3K and Alternative 2B-2 with connectors to 5A2E3K were dismissed from further consideration in favor of retaining variations of these alternatives with less adverse impact to the environment. The PAC suggested that the MaineDOT and the FHWA further reduce the range of alternatives being considered to only those that the MaineDOT and the FHWA are most seriously considering and rename those alternatives using simpler names. |

The study purpose and needs, range of alternatives considered for satisfying needs and purpose, preliminary alternatives screening, the range of alternatives retained for further consideration, and next steps were presented. The concerns and suggestions for improving the study were to look for more immediate ways to ease congestion on I-395 and Route 1A, give consideration to the No-Build Alternative, consider the cost effectiveness of alternatives as part of the evaluation, seek ways to minimize impacts to individual properties, enforce the no-passing regulation on Route 46, reinstitute freight and passenger rail on the former Calais branch, consider wildlife mortality in the evaluation of alternatives, and consider actions to improve the safety on Route 46. There were no key resources or issues of primary concern identified.

#### **4.3.3 Website**

A study-specific website ([www.i395-rt9-study.com](http://www.i395-rt9-study.com) or the MaineDOT website: [www.maine.gov/mdot/major-planning-studies/major-planning-stds.php](http://www.maine.gov/mdot/major-planning-studies/major-planning-stds.php)) was developed early in the study and updated frequently. The website consists of a home page, a study overview, frequently asked questions, a “Stay Informed” page, resources (i.e., maps and publications), a glossary, and a links page. Shortly after each meeting, materials in support of the public-involvement program, including meeting agendas, handouts, maps, presentations,

displays, and minutes, were placed on the website on the “Stay Informed” page.

#### **4.3.4 Public Information**

In support of the public-involvement program, circulation of public information was an important part of the study. Public information was released throughout the study in the forms of newspaper articles, press releases, newsletters, and posters on display in city and town offices.

• THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK •